DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 363 255 HE 026 919

TITLE	New Demands, Enduring Values: The Challenge of Human Resources. Highlights of a Transatlantic Seminar on Higher Education (College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, February 10-12, 1993).
INSTITUTION	American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.; Standing Conference of Rectors, Presidents, and Vice-Chancellors of the European Universities.
PUB DATE	Feb 93
NOTE	83p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Department TAS, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036 ($8 postpaid).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Role; Change Strategies; College Presidents; *Educational Change; *Educational Economics; Futures (of Society); *Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; *Human Resources; *International Cooperation; Professional Associations

ABSTRACT

A 1993 meeting of academic leaders from the United States and European universities, one of a series on the future of higher education, is summarized. The central issues were the preparation of higher education for the future in the midst of massive global change, the collaborative roles of the American Council on Education and the Standing Conference of Rectors, Presidents, and Vice-Chancellors of the European Universities in responding to new demands and challenges, and the potential of these agencies for providing assistance to faculty and staff in coping with change. Related issues discussed include: the changing social and economic context of higher education; tension between the state and the university; variability in the circumstances of each institution; retrenchment; and better use of human resources (students, faculty, administrators), including use of technology to assist with progress. The conference concluded with recognition of five principles to guide change: continuing the dialogue; including Canada in the interaction; concentrating on institutional, not individual or disciplinary, objectives; broadening and deepening the conversation; and establishing a steering group for transatlantic networking. Participants in each conference and their institutional affiliations are listed. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 363 255

De… rn… Values: …nal… Resources

…s of a Tra… …Higher Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ACE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

IAE 026 917

Sponsored by
The American Council
on Education (ACE)
and The Standing Conference
of Rectors, Presidents, and
Vice-Chancellors of the
European Universities (CRE)

College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia, USA
February 10-12, 1993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

New Demands, Enduring Values: The Challenge of Human Resources

Highlights of a Transatlantic Seminar on Higher Education

Sponsored by
The American Council on Education (ACE)
and
The Standing Conference of
Rectors, Presidents, and Vice-Chancellors of the European Universities (CRE)

Hosted by the College of William and Mary
as part of the College's Tercentenary Celebration

Williamsburg, Virginia, USA
February 10–12, 1993

© 1993 American Council on Education. Printed in the United States of America.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the Publisher.

American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle
Washington, DC 20036

Additional copies of this publication may be purchased from the American Council on Education for $8.00 postpaid. All orders must be prepaid by money order or check (made payable to the American Council on Education) and sent to:

Publications Department TAS
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle
Washington, DC 20036

This publication was produced on a Macintosh IIci using Microsoft Word 4.0, and Aldus PageMaker 4.2 software.

Table of Contents

Foreword 1

A Vision That Is Not Utopian 3

- The Changing Context 6
- Tension Between the State and the University 9
  - Autonomy 9
  - Employability 10
- Institutional Similarities and Differences 12
- Doing More with Less 15
- Transforming Human Resources to Face the Future 17
  - Helping Students Learn Better 17
  - Technology 18
  - Academic Staff 19
  - Role of Presidents and Rectors 22
- Conclusions 23
- Next Steps 27

Conference Participants 29

Foreword

For three days in February 1993, more than 40 European and North American academic leaders gathered in Williamsburg, Virginia to continue a three-year-old conversation about the future of higher education and to explore mechanisms for pouring new energy into the academy's human resources, its faculty and staff.

All told, college and university presidents and rectors at the gathering represented 18 nations: Belgium, Canada, The Czech Republic, England, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, The Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States.

The meeting, jointly organized by the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Conference of European Rectors (CRE), continued a discussion begun at the University of Hartford (USA) in October 1989 and expanded at the Free University of Brussels (Belgium) in September 1991. The Hartford discussion explored the value of a regular transatlantic exchange of ideas between presidents and rectors. The Belgium conference examined the "three A's" of higher education in transition: autonomy, accountability and authority. The Williamsburg seminar concluded that the time has come to broaden and deepen this dialogue by creating transatlantic institutional relationships to help renew university human resources.

The February setting symbolized the ties that bind together Europe and North America and their academic institutions. The seminar was held amidst the tercentenary celebration of the second institution established to encourage higher learning in the United States: On February 8, 1693, 300 years almost to the day before the seminar convened, William of Orange and his wife Mary granted a charter for a college in the colony of Virginia—the College of William and Mary. Seminar participants added to the tercentenary activities and drew on the celebration's discussions.

As always, the conversation was serious, wide-ranging, and lively. Dispensing with prepared papers and formal presentations, the seminar emphasized vigorous give-and-take among participants. It covered the ancient obligation of higher education to advance knowledge and defend inquiry, and the modern challenge to extend human freedom and advance opportunity for the disadvantaged. It examined today's difficulties and explored tomorrow's possibilities. It balanced a pessimistic appraisal of the immediate financial prospects for higher education with the optimistic conclusion that the university's 900-year history entitles academic leaders to face the future with confidence.

Throughout the three days, wherever the conversation led, it returned time and again to the central issues

before the participants: Amidst massive global change, how should students be prepared for a future that today is unimaginable? What collaborative role can ACE and CRE play jointly to help higher education respond to new demands and defend the values of the academy and the society that supports it? How can ACE and CRE help university faculty members and staff cope with the challenges ahead?

To those who participated in this fascinating conversation, our thanks. To those who were not able to be with us, we hope this document opens a window on the discussion and on how ACE and CRE plan to proceed.

Robert H. Atwell
President
American Council on
Education (USA)

Josep M. Bricall
Rector
University of Barcelona (Spain)
and *Vice President*
Conference of
European Rectors

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Vision That Is Not Utopian

"The issue of reform of the university is embedded in the larger relationship between education and society. The practical problem is that reform depends on the education system continuing to work, while, at the same time, innovating quickly and boldly. From first-year schoolmasters to the minister of education, the problem of reforming the system and restoring the interior life of the university is the problem of renewing human resources."

With these words, Emil Constantinescu (University of Bucharest), one of the architects of freedom in Central and Eastern Europe and a former candidate for the presidency of Romania, defined the task before the seminar: Against the backdrop of pressure for change, is a new vision of teaching, learning, and research required of the university? If so, what are the implications for teaching staff, the university's most significant asset?

The larger social context is critical, agreed Gordon Davies (State Council of Higher Education for Virginia). Virginia's recent reform effort was driven by the realization that the state's traditional student of yesterday is today in the minority. "Today's nontraditional student in Virginia and the United States is 18 years old, white, male, attends school full time, and lives in a dormitory. Transforming teaching and administration must respond to this new reality."

Responding to society's demand for a better university, said Pierre Ducrey (University of Lausanne, Switzerland), is not simply a matter of producing "a better product, better graduates, better teachers and research," it also involves the hard work of "developing a vision that is not utopian." Utopia is not a concern in the Czech Republic, responded Stanislav Hanzl (Czech Technical University). "We are trying to marry reform and survival."

In a wide-ranging discussion led by Humphrey Tonkin (University of Hartford), the joint ACE/CRE seminar began by exploring the role of human resources in transforming the university. The departure point for the conversation was a straightforward question: How can institutions make better use of their faculty and staff in responding to the accelerating demands of society?

But the discussion ranged far afield, as presidents and rectors grappled with the complexities of the human resources issue in the context of other concerns: relationship of the state (nation) to higher education…career preparation…liberal education…

the acute financial crisis afflicting higher education everywhere…differences between the North American and European traditions of higher education (and equally noteworthy differences within each tradition)…and the critical role personnel play in transforming any organization. This broad discussion drew on themes already familiar to the many participants who had attended the earlier ACE/CRE meetings in Hartford, Connecticut, and Brussels, Belgium (see sidebar). Revisiting these themes permitted seminar participants to venture from familiar footing onto the new ground of human resources. The Williamsburg discussion produced a simple conclusion: "The game has changed," declared Tonkin. "We need to understand what that means for our own institutions, what it means for the larger society, and what we should do about it."

Before turning their attention to a joint ACE/CRE action agenda to address human resource development, seminar participants concentrated on five interrelated themes:

- the changing context for higher education;
- tension between the state and the university;
- institutional similarities and differences;
- doing more with less; and
- transforming human resources to face the future.

Whatever we do to respond to these difficult challenges, warned Míceál Ledwith (St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Ireland), we should not forget that the university has survived for 900 years under all kinds of regimes and all kinds of difficulties. "Amidst the pressures for change, university leaders must give priority to education of high quality. If we forget who we are and why we exist, we may do ourselves far more damage than any critic."

With that caution ringing in their ears, the seminar's participants turned to the challenge before them.

Hartford and Brussels: Setting the Stage for Williamsburg

Just over three years ago, in October 1989, some of us met at the University of Hartford to envisage transatlantic collaboration.

For me, it was a first multilateral institutional contact between American and European universities. I learned a lot in Hartford concerning the university situation in this country, and I believe that the same is true for Americans concerning European universities.

But at the Hartford meeting, which occurred very shortly after the downfall of the iron curtain, both Americans and Europeans discovered the tragic reality of Eastern and Central European universities. So this first meeting turned out to be very interesting and incited the ACE and the CRE to pursue their efforts of sustained contact. I think it was a very good idea.

Two years later, in September 1991, a meeting was scheduled in Brussels. This time the agenda was more precise and focused on the status of universities in their environment. More particularly, we discussed autonomy, authority, and accountability—the three A's of our respective universities.

One of the commonalities that emerged in Brussels was, obviously, concern for the future in view of the dreary prospects that lay ahead. The corollary to this concern was, of course, the question of how to preserve our primordial task of creating and transmitting knowledge and skills....

As a matter of fact, if this third seminar is successful (as I do not doubt it will be) it could be a springboard to an in-depth transatlantic analysis of the essence of the university of the 21st century. Together we can define the missions we want to maintain at all costs, as well as the less relevant activities. If choices have to be made in the future, it is important that we confront our respective priorities—to everyone's benefit.

Georges Verhaegen,
Former Rector
Free University of Brussels

The Changing Context

Tonkin's summary, "The game has changed," echoed throughout the meeting as participants explored the problems of higher education in a new era and a changed environment—the need to increase revenue while reducing expenditures; "downsizing," "re-structuring," and "re-engineering" the academy; the relationship of higher education to technology and economic growth; government interest in outcomes; and the growing demand for greater access for more students, each better trained for available work.

"The game today is money, its sources in society, and its effective use," said Antonis Trakatellis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece). According to Trakatellis, academic leaders need a much better understanding of new pressures—increased enrollments, costs of developing new knowledge and meeting the needs of new students, and the imperative for staff development. Without such an understanding, he said, universities will be unable to mount more effective programs or take on the hard work of "reducing curricular overlap, updating curriculum, using new technologies in teaching, and encouraging students so that they do not require spoon feeding but can be more active participants in their own learning."

In the face of these many challenges, higher education in North America and Europe stands equally unprepared, participants agreed. Higher education in Europe has many strengths—a strong sense of what a university is, a commitment to faculty governance, free access for qualified students, and agreements such as ERASMUS encouraging student mobility. Nonetheless, dealing with part-time and older students is difficult, and mobility between institutions and among nations remains a problem.

North America, particularly the United States, prizes the diversity of its institutions—a mix of public and private, large and small, two-year and four-year colleges and universities—and the ready access they provide. Yet North America has its own difficulties, including high tuition, comparability of standards among institutions, an expensive residential tradition, and indebtedness across the board—on the part of students, institutions, and states. In an address to participants at the College of William and Mary's tercentenary celebration, Robert Atwell (American Council on Education) warned that some observers in the United States are worried about a "coming war" between public and private institutions.

Several participants suggested that, precisely because the game has changed, higher education needs to look at the world in a new way. Boel Flodgren (Lund

University, Sweden) shone a different light on traditional concerns when she asked, "Is higher education a human right? Should we not wonder if it is not time to think of access to our institutions as a fundamental right? If that is the case, how do we think about higher education as a social service and what does that mean for our faculty, both young and old?"

In many ways, the conversation revolved around the difficulty of trying to predict the future and prepare students for it. "Academic leaders have a tendency to worry about finances," said Betty Turner Asher (University of South Dakota), "but the main problem of today's university is not entirely financial. It is the difficulty of anticipating a future that we cannot today even imagine." Frank Newman (Education Commission of the States) agreed: "We are all struggling with the notion that education should equip students to live in a 21st century democracy," he said. "What do students need to know and be able to do, not just to succeed in the workforce, but to live in free societies?" he asked.

John Casteen (University of Virginia) suggested that academic leaders might want to reconsider some of their own assumptions. He pointed out that teaching is always in transition, noting ancient debates about the Socratic method and successful 20th century efforts to develop case studies in legal education, clinical experience in medicine, and coaching techniques for undergraduates to buttress his point.

D. Bruce Johnstone, Boel Flodgren, and A.J.M. Plasschaert

In fact, participants agreed, the stability of the debate about the purposes of the university and its relationship to the larger society is in many ways encouraging. The answers to these questions are important. But equally significant, as a mark of the health of higher education, is the determination of academic leaders to continue raising them.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Tension between the State and the University

Ireland's Ledwith opened Pandora's box by pointing to what he called emerging "tensions between the state and the university." Throughout Europe, particularly in Ireland and Great Britain, he said, a "new third sector" of higher education has evolved. Unlike the traditional university, it is technological and career-oriented. This is an important development, he stressed, because it represents "an effort on the part of governments to sidestep universities and create a more malleable, technical higher education." His comments stimulated a running three-day dialogue about higher education institutions' autonomy and the employability of their graduates.

Autonomy

Higher education is faced with several false choices, suggested Pauline Perry, Baroness of Southwark, (South Bank University, England). One choice appears to be between access and opportunity for the disadvantaged, on the one hand, and academic exclusion, on the other. "In England, this has led to a mad scramble for 'A level' points: the higher the testing average of incoming students, the more exclusive your institution is and, therefore, the better." Equally unpromising is the distinction between research universities and teaching institutions.

Picking up the notion of distinctions, Elisabeth Zinser (University of Idaho) suggested that people in higher education need to rethink the idea that growing into a traditional research university is what all institutions should do. "Despite provincial political and academic pressures to be all things to all people, differentiation is needed," she argued. "Societies should think of the kind of portfolio of institutions they want." Sweden's Flodgren noted that "Old fashioned, big institutions such as my own are very conservative. But now the government seeks competition among institutions and steers these institutions through financial support. It might be worthwhile to think not of growth across the board, but of selective growth in areas of strength, institution by institution. We should be worrying about expanding our profile of competence."

Paul Elsner (Maricopa County Community College District) took issue with the notion of differentiation. "Role definition is not the answer," he asserted. In the United States, he said, far too many states are unwilling

Humphrey Tonkin and Robert Scott

to finance access to traditional four-year institutions and thus are forcing students into community colleges. Role definition is a red herring, he concluded. The real issue is: "Can higher education transform itself?"

Government encouragement of competition among institutions, the growth of a "new third sector," and pressure for differentiation represent a real threat to university autonomy and independence, suggested François Pitavy (University of Bourgogne, France). "There is a danger of authoritarianism in all of this," he suggested, a sentiment shared by Hartford's Tonkin, who warned that "the more we erode institutional structures, the more we run the risk of authoritarianism."

In the United States, suggested ACE's Atwell, it may be too late to head off centralizing tendencies that compromise campus autonomy: "That horse is already out of the barn," he said, describing more than 120 multicampus systems that are responsible for two-thirds of the 1,500 public campuses in the United States and that enroll 50 percent of the nation's students. Meanwhile, various levels of government in the United States continue to push for statewide planning, differentiated missions, performance-based funding, and other forms of accountability. None of us, Atwell concluded, can argue with the growing movement toward accountability; but we need to worry about the directions this movement takes.

Employability

Throughout the seminar discussion and William and Mary's tercentenary activities, an intense debate revolved around the perception that the public on both sides of the Atlantic is demanding more attention to workforce preparation in the face of academic insistence that universities continue to emphasize the importance of a liberal education.

Claude Lajeunesse (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada) thinks it is clear that Canadians are looking for a shift in academic priorities. "Graduate education and research are expensive and poorly understood by the public," he noted. "Parents and students in Canada are interested in the quality of undergraduate education and its relevance to their careers."

A similar message came from across the Atlantic. In Europe, said the Czech Republic's Hanzl, academic leaders have had to make some assumptions. "First, the university must provide students with an education that helps them get a job. Second, in Central and Eastern Europe, the product – that is, the graduate – has to be marketable. But employers do not really know what they need, so people have to be prepared for change, for diverse circumstances."

The employability issue was a central feature of a televised panel, "America's Investment in Liberal

Education: What, How Much, and for Whom?" The panel was sponsored by the College of William and Mary as part of its tercentenary celebration and was moderated by Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist Roger Mudd. Panelist Lynne V. Cheney, former head of the National Endowment for the Humanities, argued that, in their search for "political correctness," American universities have lost sight of the concerns of students and parents for an education that leads to work. Fellow panelist Leon Botstein, president of Bard College, took sharp and pointed exception to this view. "What we are seeing here," he said, "is the tension first identified in the United States by de Tocqueville, the tension between excellence and democratic values. The public has been sold a bill of goods—the idea that liberal education is useless, that it is for a leisure class, or for wealthy people, or more particularly for white people. The truth is that liberal education is for people who want to work and want to succeed at work."

In the ensuing conversations, most seminar participants supported Botstein's view, arguing that technically trained graduates without lifelong learning run the risk of watching new developments outpace their training. Rolandas Pavilonis (Vilnius University, Lithuania) described employability as a significant concern in Central and Eastern Europe. But, he continued, we are being presented with yet another false

Emil Constantinescu and Jøzsef Hamori

choice, that of developing students' minds or preparing them for careers. The best solution, he suggested, would be a marriage of the two. Jøzsef Hamori (Janus Pannonius University, Hungary) noted that "specific facts are important. But it is more important to teach people *how* to learn, *how* to ask the right questions. The dichotomy between developing the mind and training cannot be solved and it is ridiculous to try to do so since both are needed."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Institutional Similarities and Differences

As the seminar progressed, a theme that had developed both in Hartford in 1989 and in Brussels in 1991 began to reassert itself: Circumstances distinguishing individual institutions are not nearly as significant as the problems they share. Higher education on both sides of the Atlantic is more similar than distinct, characterized by forces for expansion and demands for academic responses to economic and other social needs. As England's Perry put it, the degree to which higher education around the globe shares similar difficulties is remarkable. "It is something of a relief," she confessed, "to learn that our difficulties are not a consequence of our own incompetence, but of the nature of change in the world around us."

Despite shared difficulties, significant differences were not overlooked.

Perhaps the most obvious distinctions lie in academic areas—in the amount of time required to attain an undergraduate degree and how students demonstrate they have earned the degree. Perry pointed out that at Cambridge University the requirements imposed on undergraduates are very few. "The only absolute requirements are that students attend, in the course of three years, at least two lectures each year; participate regularly in their weekly tutorials; and perform (brilliantly, one hopes) on the examination." Switzerland's Ducrey made the same point in a different way. "Universities in Europe, as everywhere else, are based on the principle that everyone is free," he said. "One of the things that means is that students are free to work, and they are free not to work. They are, however, obliged to pass an examination to demonstrate their knowledge. If you do not pass, you have nothing."

D. Bruce Johnstone (State University of New York) posited that the periodic examination approach was something Americans should consider. "We worry about courses and course credits, over a four-year period," he said. "But mastery, not seat time, should be the overwhelming variable." In the United States, he pointed out, "there is a lot of wasted time. Most of us offer two 15-week semesters; time during the day, week, and month is often poorly used. We romanticize all of this as a 'period of growth for the student,' but I wonder if a lot of it is not aimless drift."

Americans should not be too quick to generalize about Europe, warned Ducrey. There are, he pointed out, huge differences within the continent, both North and South and East and West. "Northern Europe is wealthy and is able to afford a particular view, that higher education should be considered a basic human right. But in Southern Europe, a quite different situa-

Participants in the 1993 ACE/CRE seminar.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

tion prevails; in the South, there simply is not the same state of economic development. And, of course, for the last 50 years, we lost our right arm, our friends in the East. They are emerging from a catastrophic state."

Most people in the West, according to Eastern European participants, have some understanding of the economic difficulties in Eastern Europe, but few realize the profound implications of these difficulties for the university. Lithuania's Pavilionis described Eastern European societies in the midst of chaotic change: "No one can foresee how all of this will work out but, whatever happens, the role of the university in the East is now much more important than it was before. Our institutions are critical to the survival of the state." He concluded with an appeal for a "Marshall Plan for the universities of Eastern Europe."

Romania's Constantinescu emphasized the crisis facing the university in Eastern Europe: "a crisis in educational policy; a crisis in self-knowledge; a crisis in knowledge itself; a crisis in human resources; a crisis of leadership; a crisis of financial means; and a crisis in projected capacity." If we are to survive, he concluded, the university has to innovate quickly, boldly, and effectively.

Baroness Pauline Perry of Southwark and Alison de Puymège

Doing More with Less

"The supreme irony in all this," said ACE's Atwell, "is that society's expectations of higher education are rising while the resources are diminishing. We are all being asked to do more with less."

"There has been a massive, hidden transfer of who pays for higher education in the United States," charged the University of Virginia's Casteen. "Here in the state of Virginia, the state has developed superb concepts about the future of higher education, but it has refused to put state money behind state words. This results not so much from failures of vision as from disasters in public finance."

Casteen agreed with Timothy Sullivan (College of William and Mary) when the latter noted that the "democratic nature of academic governance makes it difficult to achieve efficient results." The economic situation of recent years, said Sullivan, "has hurt higher education, which has fallen in the government's priority list behind other compelling human needs such as health care, prisons, and the expenses of elementary and secondary education." Both Sullivan and Casteen described efforts to address financial difficulties by reducing staff, reallocating funds from administration to faculty support, and working with business models such as joint ventures and site-management.

Virginia's Gordon Davies spoke for most of the North American participants when he noted, "We need to face the truth: If we wait for money to come so that we can afford to solve all of higher education's problems, we will never solve them."

Difficult as this situation appears to North American education leaders, the problems of several European rectors appeared to be of an entirely different order of magnitude. "In the Virginia document, *The Case for Change: The Commission on the University of the 21st Century*, I find 17 points of almost exact correlation with the situation we face in the Czech Republic," said Hanzl. "The huge difference, however, is that higher education is on the governor's list of important assets that need attention in Virginia. In our country, we are not on the government's list."

The political dilemma for higher education in the United States was defined by the State University of New York's Johnstone and Newman of the Education Commission of the States. Said Johnstone: "It is not the case that public officials do not think we are important and are unwilling to support us. They simply do not agree that we need all of the resources we have persuaded ourselves we need." It is a management issue, according to Johnstone: "Public officials believe we can do what we need to do with less." Newman agreed, arguing that American leaders of higher education are

in a very poor position to make the case for additional support: "A politician is likely to say to us: Higher education received a lot of extra money in the 1980s and it didn't solve any of these huge social problems. Instead, it built a costly new superstructure for itself."

Hungary's Hamori noted a similar problem in Europe: "For us this issue is how to persuade public officials that we take seriously both training needs and the intellectual development of students."

Lattie Coor (Arizona State University) painted the transatlantic picture of university finance in broad-brush strokes and worried that students increasingly are being asked to pick up more of the bill. To oversimplify, he said, "In Europe, universities are state funded; students pay very little. In the United States, by contrast, that is not the model at all. Public institutions in the United States are like the European model in many ways, but students still pay a significant share of the costs. At private institutions, students pay almost all the costs, even if they need financial assistance to do so. There is a third model of state-assisted institutions in which the state helps with university costs, and the student also pays. The clear tendency in the United States," concluded Coor, "is to move away from the public model toward a private or state-assisted model."

Several Americans offered the observation that the U.S. system of financing higher education tends to make education a consumer good for which students should be asked to pay a significant share. "Let's face it," said Hartford's Tonkin, "you can create private institutions by subsidizing students. The basic question is whether society subsidizes institutions or subsidizes students." Europeans are worrying about the same question. According to the Czech Republic's Hanzl, his country is now moving toward requiring students to pay up to 20 percent of their education costs. "Should we," he asked, "agree to students paying anything?" Perhaps, but not a percentage, counseled Georges Verhaegen (Free University of Brussels, Belgium). Said Verhaegen: "I personally don't like the idea of students paying a percentage of the costs of their education.... On the other hand, students should pay something—otherwise they will not value what they are receiving."

"All in all," summed up Tonkin, "higher education on both sides of the Atlantic is being asked to accomplish more with less financial support. That brings us to human resources: Our institutional leaders must make it clear that there is no point in trying to do more of the same with less; inevitably that will lead to doing it worse. We have to do things better and we have to do them differently."

Transforming Human Resources to Face the Future

However we approach renewing human resources, suggested Belgium's Verhaegen, "it is a mistake to be pessimistic. Universities have survived 900 years; since the Middle Ages, they have lived through turmoil of all kinds, many different regimes, and repression. Their survival is evidence of the strength and independence of the faculty. I remain an optimist." The University of Idaho's Zinser seconded the call for optimism: "None of us wants to be associated with the working definition of a pessimist my mother used, in jest," she said. "A pessimist is a person who feels bad when he feels good, for fear he'll feel worse when he feels better!"

The need for optimism became all the more apparent as seminar participants listened sympathetically to descriptions of the human resource dilemmas of higher education in Central and Eastern Europe. Said Lithuania's Pavilionis: "Former secret government research agencies are closing down; many faculties, particularly in the social sciences and law, require wholesale retraining to shift their views from managed economies and the primacy of the state to free markets and the primacy of the individual." The problem is not simply in the social sciences, said the Czech Republic's Hanzl. "About a quarter of the 12,000 scientists employed until recently in academic settings in my country have been put out of work. We are worried about losing our most talented people to the West."

The discussion of human resource renewal revolved around four themes:

- the need to help students learn better;
- the promise of technology;
- the importance of developing academic staff; and
- the role of presidents and rectors.

Helping Students Learn Better

If academic leaders are to do things differently, declared the State University of New York's Johnstone, they need to think through the human resources issue in a new way. The problem should not be thought of as "the sterile one that has dominated most discussions in higher education—conversations around how to make teachers work harder. What we should be worrying about is how students can learn better."

That problem, suggested the University of South Dakota's Asher, has to be approached by asking the question, "How should we respond to the expressed needs of students? Asking this question involves

finding a new balance between teaching and research." At a minimum, thought Asher, universities should worry about over-reliance on lecturing in teaching, the development of new teachers, and the need for new systems of faculty rewards and formal faculty evaluations.

In a major address at the College of William and Mary's tercentenary activities, Belgium's Verhaegen captured one aspect of the seminar's discussion with the following remarks:

"From a European standpoint...I would favor fewer courses, increased personal work, and an early initiation to research. Such a reform should enhance the student's initiative and creativity as well as an in-depth understanding of his future discipline. However, this requires more attention and time from teaching personnel. Fewer courses have to be compensated by better courses. More personal work implies careful correction and positive criticism of the student's achievements. Early initiation to research requires that researchers spend some of their precious time initiating students to the major issues and ideas underlying their discipline."

Verhaegen concluded with an appeal to "rehabilitate" teaching in the academy by incorporating teaching proficiency as a significant consideration in tenure decisions.

Technology

Technology is both a promise and a false solution, according to Hartford's Tonkin. On the one hand, today's young people have grown up with the latest technologies in their homes and schools. More comfortable with technology than many of their parents, they also may be better prepared to take advantage of the promise of new interactive technologies in classrooms, at home, and on the job. On the other hand, universities must be wary of the temptation to try to solve their teaching problems solely with technology. Despite its promise, technology is "no substitute for human contact," noted Tonkin.

But virtually everyone agreed with ACE's Atwell about the need to employ new technologies more creatively. "New technologies on campus today are found mostly in administrative applications," said Atwell. "We find comparatively little use of interactive technologies in teaching, and although the possibilities exist for interactive coursework on the job or at home, it is largely unavailable. Perhaps that is not surprising," he concluded. "Academics, after all, are a lot better at giving advice to others about how to change their enterprises than they are at seeing how some of that advice might apply to their own settings."

Seminar participants expressed a great deal of interest in a report from the Virginia Polytechnic

Institute and State University on the potential impact of digital technologies on the academic world. According to this report, new technologies offer the promise of transforming the constraints of time and space in teaching and learning. They can do so by offering faculty new possibilities for more informal student contact outside the classroom. But if that is to happen, three significant problems must be resolved: Physical facilities generally do not provide appropriate space for informal contact with students; the reward structures for faculty and students on campus need attention; and most faculty members require training not simply in the technologies, but also in dealing with students on a more informal basis.

We need a better understanding of the cost implications of greater utilization of technology on campus, said Maricopa Community Colleges' Elsner. "Most policymakers have little idea of the costs involved simply in maintaining existing technology networks on large campuses. They are mistaken if they think they can save money with technology. It is not free."

Academic Staff

Reinvigorating learning starts with staff development, a process that requires academic leaders to worry about the balance between experienced teachers and new blood on faculties, the training

Stanislav Hanzl and Madeleine Green

of prospective faculty members, and faculty resistance to change.

The key to the human resources dilemma in many American institutions, according to William and Mary's Sullivan, lies in finding ways to encourage an aging faculty to experiment with new ideas. He described his institution's two-part approach: First, "at William and Mary, we had a huge growth in the size of our faculty in the 1960s; as the 1990s dawned, we found ourselves with an older faculty. So we have introduced incentives for early retirement. Last year, we added more new faculty members than at any time in the last 30 years."

Second, William and Mary encourages faculty development through sabbaticals, "May Seminars" (college-funded planning and experimentation time), and a statewide "Fund for Excellence" that provides support for faculty development. "These efforts," he finished, "support training and the development of new curriculum. But nobody in the state of Virginia is really addressing the issue of large-scale faculty development."

The balance between the vigor of youth and the perspective of age is also a problem in Eastern Europe, according to Michal Sewerynski (University of Lódz, Poland). "In Poland, we think of it in terms of how to teach more students with fewer teachers. Tenure in Poland requires two levels of Ph.D. work; nobody can be a full professor without both. Not surprisingly, the average age of full professors is 60 years. The choice we face involves either continuing the high demands for professorial preparation or reducing them. With the first choice, we get smaller numbers of professors and lower numbers of students. With the second, we can have more faculty members and more students."

Higher education needs to pay more attention to developing the next generation of faculty members, said the University of South Dakota's Asher. "Mentoring for prospective faculty members is important," she stressed. "Universities need to pay far more attention to the science of teaching and to helping graduate students teach well. All of this needs to take place while we worry about shifting to a younger generation of faculty members."

Arizona State University's Coor introduced a significant barrier to institutional change: faculty resistance to innovation. Describing a new and successful cooperative teaching effort on his own campus, he noted that many faculty members remain unenthusiastic. This lack of enthusiasm is a problem, agreed Lithuania's Pavilionis. "It is very difficult to move new ideas through the faculty. We find a lot of energy around new ideas, but sooner or later it all breaks down and returns to old methods." Asher expressed similar

frustration. Noting that this conversation had been going on forever, she wondered, "Is there something about the dynamics of university operations that makes them impossible to change?"

Perhaps, suggested Coor, we need to approach this issue more from a pedagogical standpoint than from traditional policy perspectives. At Arizona State, he said, new kinds of students—older, part-time, often with different learning styles—have led faculty members across disciplines (engineers, medieval scholars, and social scientists) into cooperative teaching efforts. Some teachers see themselves as moving from the role of "sage on the stage" to that of "guide on the side." According to Coor, these experiments have created powerful new strategies to help faculty members think about teaching and learning.

Role of Presidents and Rectors

Charles Ping (Ohio University) put a strategic spin on the discussion of human resource renewal by pointing out, "As presidents and rectors, we are uniquely suited to worry about this issue: Our job is to worry about the institution and its well-being as an institution, not simply discrete parts of the enterprise. But we have few opportunities such as this meeting to educate ourselves about our institutional obligations as change agents."

Heads nodded in agreement around the table as Ping wondered aloud, "Why is it that after decades of international exchange programs—faculty exchanges, international scientific conferences, and annual migrations of hundreds of thousands of students across borders and oceans—we see so little impact on our institutions?" Affirming the value of faculty and student exchanges, Ping made the case that they need to be supplemented with some transatlantic effort aimed at what he termed the "institutional imperative," something that provides benefits not simply to individuals but to institutions as institutions.

In that vein, Poland's Sewerynski noted the high level of turnover among American and European presidents. "As rectors, we in Europe are elected by faculty and are expected to leave office after three years, or perhaps as many as six. In the United States and Canada, presidential change is also a significant issue. Presidents and rectors require continuing education on international aspects of higher education."

Conclusions

At the closing session, chaired by the State University of New York's Johnstone, the participants agreed on the value of the transatlantic conversation and on five principles to help ACE and CRE extend the dialogue. The principles should not be thought of as old wine in new bottles, said Neil S. Bucklew (West Virginia University). "A better description is new wine in old bottles."

Principle 1:
At a minimum, continue what we are doing.

Arizona State's Coor captured the sense of the group when he said that whatever is done, the transatlantic meetings should continue: "Most of us have far too many meetings on our calendars, and I was skeptical about whether or not to come to this one. Too many meetings consist of nothing more than people reading papers to one another. But here we have had a very productive conversation. I have moved from skepticism to affirming the value of what we are doing and the need to continue doing it."

Strong support for this view came from Ireland's Ledwith: "This was a stimulating meeting that needs to be continued. European rectors and presidents have had very different roles in the past from that of presidents of universities in the United States. But the roles are becoming more similar and we need to learn from each other; the American president needs to become more involved in academic concerns, the European rector to pay more attention to management and financial issues. We are being forced into each other's arms as together we enter a vastly different world. But we should remember that 'He who marries the spirit of the age is soon a widower.' Navigating in this new world requires us to keep our eyes on the stars and on our central obligation, namely the welfare of the students. In this new world, if we do not make the decisions about the future of the university, the matter will be taken out of our hands."

In fact, added Poland's Sewerynski, the discussion must be expanded. "This meeting, valuable as it is, is too limited, too small. We need to expand the discussion.... We need a rectors exchange program as much as student exchange programs." The importance of such an effort is self-evident, suggested Greece's Trakatellis: "The university is international by nature. The province of knowledge is the world."

Hanzl described some of Eastern Europe's experiences with technical assistance from the West. "Since 1989," he said, "we in the East have started meeting Westerners. We wanted these meetings desperately, since they were our first contacts with the West after

43 years of darkness. Most of these people arrived and stayed at the Intercontinental Hotel. But we did not know these people and had never seen most of them before. And we never saw them again."

"I offer this experience as a footnote on what ACE and CRE should avoid," he added. Stressing that ephemeral contact with Western institutions is of little assistance to East European universities, Hanzl maintained that any ACE/CRE effort should offer sustained contact.

Principle 2:
Structure the effort as a three-way conversation.

Noting the participation of Canada's Lajeunesse in the seminar, Johnstone stressed that the conversation should be thought of not as one between Europe and the United States, but as one between Europe and North America.

However, he thought that because higher education in different countries in Europe is at different levels of development, distinctions must be made between those in the East and those in the West. "Eastern and Central

Claude Lajeunesse

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

European universities have unique problems in comparison with their Western European counterparts," he said. "They are demonstrably poorer in resources; demonstrably in trouble in the social sciences, law, and the humanities; and demonstrably vulnerable to scientific 'brain drain' to the West."

We must "recognize that the relationships should be trilateral, not bilateral," he said. "At a minimum, we are talking about three separate realities: North America, Western Europe, and Eastern and Central Europe."

Principle 3:
Concentrate on institutional objectives.

Robert A. Scott (Ramapo College of New Jersey) pointed out that the common theme in reports from three small group discussions was the need to supplement existing student and faculty exchanges with an effort at institution building. Institution building is what is important, agreed Paolo Blasi (University of Florence, Italy). "Perhaps," he added, "it is also the best role for ACE and CRE." West Virginia University's Bucklew backed him up: "ACE and CRE should focus on institutional development, not on benefits for individuals or particular disciplines."

Robert I. Rotberg (Lafayette College) spoke of what he sensed as a "yearning for continuous institutional relationships designed to do what is best for students." Perhaps this could be approached by moving in reverse from existing faculty and student exchange programs, such as the Fulbright experience, to more institutional relationships. What his group had in mind, he reported, was not a program of random or short-term exchanges, but a network of continuing, structured, purposive relationships. They should be designed to strengthen learning across the Atlantic. If this effort is to succeed, he concluded, it will require presidential and rectoral blessing and involvement.

The point of such an activity, said Bengt Stenlund (Åbo Academy University, Finland), should be to build long-term relationships that provide genuine benefits to participating institutions; an effort "to bring something home." Describing the benefits to her institution of an existing small-college consortium, Barbara A. Hill (Sweet Briar College) stressed the importance of long-term commitment. "ACE's assistance with institutional networking is essential to small colleges," she said.

Principle 4:
Broaden and deepen the conversation.

Ohio University's Ping argued that, "In light of the common problems we face as presidents, and our institution-wide obligations, we need some regular, sustained mechanism so that presidents and rectors, and

other administrators, can learn from their counterparts in other countries and cultures."

A common theme of the three small working groups was that the goal of renewing human resources implies extending the conversation to include faculty members and administrators other than presidents and rectors. As A. J. M. Plasschaert (Catholic University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands) put it: "Academics always begin by thinking about student exchange programs. What about staff exchange? Faculty members may need the most help understanding institutional arrangements across the Atlantic." Each of the groups saw some promise in institutional teams of administrators and faculty members working with colleagues in a variety of ways (see below) at other institutions. Above all, said Belgium's Verhaegen, we have to make exchanges purposeful activities. We cannot, he said, create simply another exchange program: "Too frequently, they become little more than 'educational holidays.' "

Principle 5:
Establish a steering group to transatlantic networks.

The three working groups brought back to the seminar such an abundance of ideas for institutional networking that participants agreed with Johnstone's suggestion that the staff develop a small steering group to move the effort along.

Among the possibilities under discussion:

- establishing institutional teams to examine new teaching methodologies, credit and course transfer, and possibly research;

- encouraging faculty and administrative exchange around institutional issues such as academic policy, assessment, and administration and management, as well as policy issues such as financing higher education and the cost burdens on students;

- building bilateral or trilateral academic synergy (e.g., a Baltic institution might develop the Baltic side of a Baltic-American studies program, leaving the other side to a North American institution; or institutions might cooperate in developing a model program in international business education);

- fostering the cooperative development of new teaching technologies, possibly at two or more sites;

- exploring the possibility that lack of technological development in Eastern Europe presents an opportu-

nity to leap-frog the older technologies that even today remain as expensive anachronisms on many Western campuses;

- examining the feasibility of generating private revenues for universities from transnational corporations;
- involving European visitors in a systematic way in the accreditation system in the United States;
- building on what is already in place by exploring the possibilities of working with Fulbright, USIA, ERASMUS, and other international education efforts; and
- encouraging electronic networking among participants in the ACE/CRE transatlantic dialogue.

Next Steps

The seminar concluded with several procedural observations. First, ACE should take the lead in developing funding for a joint ACE/CRE effort. Second, institutions serious enough to want to participate should understand that they will have some financial obligations to the project, either in implementing it or in continuing the effort once project funding ends. Finally, the potential of this joint effort is of such consequence that participants will be expected to report back both to their own institutions and to ACE and CRE.

Subsequently, Madeleine Green (ACE) and Andris Barblan (CRE) informed the seminar participants that the steering committee would focus on forming networks of institutions willing to assume at least part of the costs for collaborative ventures. A questionnaire designed to define the areas of collaboration of greatest interest to the seminar participants has been circulated. ACE and CRE will use the responses to develop pilot efforts, for which ACE will seek external funding.

NEW DEMANDS, ENDURING VALUES: THE CHALLENGE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

A Transatlantic Seminar on Higher Education Sponsored by The American Council on Education (ACE) and The Standing Conference of Rectors, Presidents, and Vice-Chancellors of the European Universities (CRE)

Williamsburg, Virginia, U.S.A.
February 10–12, 1993

EUROPEAN PARTICIPANTS

Andris Barblan
Secretary General
Conference of European Rectors
Geneva, Switzerland

Paolo Blasi
Rector
University of Florence
Florence, Italy

Josep M. Bricall
Rector
University of Barcelona
Barcelona, Spain

Emil Constantinescu
Rector
University of Bucharest
Bucharest, Romania

Pierre Ducrey
Rector
University of Lausanne
Lausanne, Switzerland

Boel Flodgren
Rector
Lund University
Lund, Sweden

József Hamori
Rector
Janus Pannonius University
Pécs, Hungary

Stanislav Hanzl
Rector
Czech Technical University
Prague, The Czech Republic

Míceál Ledwith
President
St. Patrick's College
Maynooth, Ireland

Rolandas Pavilonis
Rector
Vilnius University
Vilnius, Lithuania

Baroness Pauline Perry
Vice-Chancellor
South Bank University
London, United Kingdom

François Pitavy
Vice-President
University of Bourgogne
Dijon, France

A.J.M. Plasschaert
Rector
Catholic University
Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Alison de Puymège
Deputy Secretary General
Conference of European Rectors
Geneva, Switzerland

Michal Sewerynski
Rector
University of Lódz
Lódz, Poland

Bengt Stenlund
Rector
Åbo Akademi University
Åbo, Finland

Antonio Trakatellis
Rector
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
Thessaloniki, Greece

Georges Verhaegen
Former Rector
Free University of Brussels
Brussels, Belgium

NORTH AMERICAN PARTICIPANTS

Betty Turner Asher
President
University of South Dakota
Vermillion, South Dakota

Robert H. Atwell
President
American Council on Education
Washington, DC

Neil S. Bucklew
President
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia

John T. Casteen, III
President
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

Lattie Coor
President
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

Gordon K. Davies
Director
State Council on Higher Education
Richmond, Virginia

Paul A. Elsner
Chancellor
Maricopa Community Colleges
Tempe, Arizona

Madeleine F. Green
Vice President
American Council on Education
Washington, DC

Barbara A. Hill
President
Sweet Briar College
Sweet Briar, Virginia

D. Bruce Johnstone
Chancellor
State University of New York System Office
Albany, New York

Claude Lajeunesse
President
Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

Frank Newman
President
Education Commission of the States
Denver, Colorado

Charles J. Ping
President
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio

Robert I. Rotberg
President
Lafayette College
Easton, Pennsylvania

Robert A. Scott
President
Ramapo College of New Jersey
Mahwah, New Jersey

Timothy J. Sullivan
President
College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia

Humphrey Tonkin
President
University of Hartford
West Hartford, Connecticut

Barbara Turlington
Director of International Education
American Council on Education
Washington, DC

Paul R. Verkuil
Former President
College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia

Elizabeth Zinser
President
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho

THE UNIVERSITY IN TRANSITION: AUTONOMY, ACCOUNTABILITY AND AUTHORITY

A Transatlantic Seminar on Higher Education Sponsored by The American Council on Education (ACE) and The Standing Conference of Rectors, Presidents, and Vice-Chancellors of the European Universities (CRE)

Brussels, Belgium
September 4–7, 1991

EUROPEAN PARTICIPANTS

Attilio Alto
Rector
University of Bari
Bari, Italy

Andris Barblan
Secretary General
Conference of European Rectors
Geneva, Switzerland

Josep M. Bricall
Rector
University of Barcelona
Barcelona, Spain

Clark Brundin
Vice Chancellor
University of Warwick
Coventry, United Kingdom

Sven Caspersen
Rector
Aalborg University
Aalborg, Sweden

Virgiliu Constantinescu
Rector
Polytechnic Institute of Bucharest
Bucharest, Romania

Bart de Schutter
Former Rector
Free University of Brussels
Brussels, Belgium

Pierre Ducrey
Rector
University of Lausanne
Lausanne, Switzerland

Aldred Ebenbauer
Pro-Rector
University of Vienna
Vienna, Austria

Hans-Uwe Erichsen
President
German Rectors' Conference
Bonn, Germany

Hans van Ginkel
Rector
Utrecht University
Utrecht, The Netherlands

Stanislav Hanzl
Rector
Czech Technical University
Prague, Czechoslovakia

Jana Hendrichova
Centre for Higher Education Studies
Prague, Czechoslovakia

Virgilio A. Meira Soares
Rector
University of Lisbon
Lisbon, Portugal

Leon De Meyer
Rector
University of Ghent
Ghent, Belgium

Jan S. Nilsson
Rector
Göteborg University
Göteborg, Sweden

Javier Pérez Royo
Rector
University of Seville
Seville, Spain

Régis Ritz
President
University of Bordeaux III
Bordeaux, France

Hinrich Seidel
Rector
Hannover University
Hannover, Germany

Michal Sewerynski
Rector
University of Lódz
Lódz, Poland

Bengt Stenlund
Rector
Åbo Akademy University
Åbo, Finland

Pierre Tabatoni
European Center for
University Strategic
Management
Brussels, Belgium

Françoise Thys-Clement
Rector
Free University of Brussels
Brussels, Belgium

Ergün Togrol
Rector
Bogaziçi University
Istanbul, Turkey

Lajos Vékás
Rector
Budapest University
Budapest, Hungary

Georges Verhaegen
Pro-Rector
Free University of Brussels
Brussels, Belgium

Luc Weber
Rector
University of Geneva
Geneva, Switzerland

Andrzej K. Wróblewski
Rector
University of Warsaw
Warsaw, Poland

NORTH AMERICAN PARTICIPANTS

Robert Albright
President
Johnson C. Smith
University
Charlotte, North Carolina

Robert Atwell
President
American Council
on Education
Washington, DC

Thomas A. Bartlett
Chancellor
Oregon State System
of Higher Education
Eugene, Oregon

Leon E. Boothe
President
Northern Kentucky
University
Highland Heights, Kentucky

Neil S. Bucklew
President
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia

Alice Chandler
President
State University of New
York College at New Paltz
New Paltz, New York

Robert L. Clodius
President
National Association of
State Universities and
Land-Grant Colleges
Washington, DC

Paul A. Elsner
Chancellor
Maricopa County
Community College District
Tempe, Arizona

James O. Freedman
President
Dartmouth College
Hanover, New Hampshire

Claire Gaudiani
President
Connecticut College
New London, Connecticut

Stanley O. Ikenberry
Chancellor
University of Illinois
Central Office
Urbana, Illinois

D. Bruce Johnstone
Chancellor
State University of New
York System Office
Albany, New York

Claude Lajeunesse
President
Association of Universities
and Colleges of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

Frank Newman
President
Education Commission
of the States
Denver, Colorado

Charles Ping
President
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio

Piedad Robertson
Secretary of Education
Commonwealth of
Massachusetts
Boston, Massachusetts

Donald Stewart
President
The College Board
New York, New York

Humphrey Tonkin
President
University of Hartford
West Hartford, Connecticut

Barbara Turlington
Director of International
Education
American Council
on Education
Washington, DC

Barbara S. Uehling
Chancellor
University of California,
Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, California

Paul R. Verkuil
President
College of William
and Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia

Robert Zemsky
Director, Institute for
Research on Higher
Education
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

JOINT CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION (ACE) AND THE STANDING CONFERENCE OF RECTORS, PRESIDENTS, AND VICE-CHANCELLORS OF THE EUROPEAN UNIVERSITIES (CRE)

The University of Hartford
Hartford, Connecticut, U.S.A.
October 25–28, 1989

NORTH AMERICAN PARTICIPANTS

Robert L. Albright
President
Johnson C. Smith University
Charlotte, North Carolina

Robert H. Atwell
President
American Council on Education
Washington, DC

Leon E. Boothe
President
Northern Kentucky University
Highland Heights, Kentucky

Ernest L. Boyer
President
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
Princeton, New Jersey

Alice Chandler
President
State University of New York at New Paltz
New Paltz, New York

John A. DiBiaggio
President
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

James O. Freedman
President
Dartmouth College
Hanover, New Hampshire

Claire Gaudiani
President
Connecticut College
New London, Connecticut

Madeleine F. Green
Vice President
American Council on Education
Washington, DC

William H. Harris
President
Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas

D. Bruce Johnstone
Chancellor
State University of New York System Office
Albany, New York

Claude Lajeunesse
Executive Director
Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

Worth Loomis
President
Hartford Graduate Center
Hartford, Connecticut

James E. Lyons
President
Bowie State University
Bowie, Maryland

M. Kathleen McGrory
President
Hartford College for Women
Hartford, Connecticut

Frank Newman
President
Education Commission of the States
Denver, Colorado

Lawrence K. Pettit
Chancellor
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois

Robert M. Rosenzweig
President
Association of American Universities
Washington, DC

M. Paton Ryan, RSM
President
Saint Joseph College
West Hartford, Connecticut

Benno C. Schmidt, Jr.
President
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

Kenneth A. Shaw
President
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Donald Stewart
President
The College Board
New York, New York

Humphrey Tonkin
President
University of Hartford
West Hartford, Connecticut

Barbara Turlington
Director of International Education
American Council on Education
Washington, DC

Barbara S. Uehling
Chancellor
University of California, Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, California

James J. Whalen
President
Ithaca College
Ithaca, New York

Richard Wood
President
Earlham College
Richmond, Indiana

EUROPEAN PARTICIPANTS

Attilio Alto
Rector
University of Bari
Bari, Italy

Clark Brundin
Vice Chancellor
University of Warwick
Coventry, United Kingdom

Paolo Bruni
Rector
University of Ancona
Ancona, Italy

Csaba Csaki
Rector
Karl Marx University of Economics
Budapest, Hungary

Pierre Ducrey
Rector
University of Lausanne
Lausanne, Switzerland

Peter Fischer-Appelt
President
University of Hamburg
Hamburg, West Germany

Dieter Heckelmann
President
Free University of Berlin
Berlin, West Germany

Aleksander Koj
Rector
Jagiellonian University
Krakow, Poland

Míceál Ledwith
President
St. Patrick's College
Maynooth, Ireland

Inge Lönning
Rector
University of Oslo
Oslo, Norway

Stanislav Merkuriev
Rector
University of Leningrad
Leningrad, U.S.S.R.

Jan S. Nilsson
Rector
University of Göteborg
Göteborg, Sweden

Javier Pérez Royo
Rector
University of Seville
Seville, Spain

Alison de Puymège
Assistant Secretary General
Conference of European
Rectors
Geneva, Switzerland

Jean Raimond
President
University of Reims
Reims, France

Bernd Rebe
President
Wilhemina Technical
University
Braunschweig, West
Germany

Alexander Rinnooy Kan
Rector
Erasmus University of
Rotterdam
Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Arne Rousi
Rector
University of Turku
Turku, Finland

Jos De Smit
Rector
Twente University
of Technology
Enschede, The Netherlands

Justin Thorens
President of the
International Association
of Universities
and former Rector
University of Geneva
Geneva, Switzerland

Ergün Togrol
Rector
Bogaziçi University
Istanbul, Turkey

Antonis Trakatellis
Rector
Aristotle University
of Thessaloniki
Thessaloniki, Greece

Slobodan Unkovic
Rector
University of Belgrade
Belgrade, Yugoslavia

Georges Verhaegen
Rector
Free University of Brussels
Brussels, Belgium

ACE Board of Directors 1993

Executive Committee
Edward A. Malloy, CSC
President
University of Notre Dame (IN)
Chair

Juliet V. Garcia
President
University of Texas at Brownsville
Vice Chair

Hoke L. Smith
President
Towson State University (MD)
Immediate Past Chair

James E. Lyons, Sr.
President
Jackson State University (MS)
Secretary

Thomas Ehrlich
President
Indiana University

Ofelia Garcia
President
Rosemont College (PA)

Thomas Gonzales
President
Front Range Community College (CO)

Robert H. Atwell
President
American Council on Education

Class of 1993
Myles Brand
President
University of Oregon

Shirley S. Chater
President
Texas Woman's University

Thomas Gonzales
President
Front Range Community College (CO)

Franklyn G. Jenifer
President
Howard University (DC)

James E. Lyons, Sr.
President
Jackson State University (MS)

Hoke L. Smith
President
Towson State University (MD)

Niara Sudarkasa
President
Lincoln University (PA)

Michael Timpane
President
Teachers College
Columbia University (NY)

Class of 1994
Jacquelyn M. Belcher
President
Minneapolis Community College (MN)

Carol A. Cartwright
President
Kent State University (OH)

Thomas Ehrlich
President
Indiana University

Claire Gaudiani
President
Connecticut College

William R. Harvey
President
Hampton University (VA)

Edward A. Malloy, CSC
President
University of Notre Dame (IN)

Robert H. McCabe
President
Miami-Dade Community College (FL)

Class of 1995
John T. Casteen, III
President
University of Virginia

Dolores E. Cross
President
Chicago State University (IL)

Juliet V. Garcia
President
University of Texas at Brownsville

Ofelia Garcia
President
Rosemont College (PA)

David Iha
Provost
Kauai Community College (HI)

Anne E. Mulder
President
Lake Michigan College (MI)

Barry A. Munitz
Chancellor
The California State University System

Michele Tolela Myers
President
Denison University (OH)

Association Representatives
Bette E. Landman
President
Beaver College (PA)
Association of American Colleges

John S. Keyser
President
Clackamas Community College (OR)
American Association of Community Colleges

John E. Van de Wetering
President
State University College of New York at Brockport
American Association of State Colleges and Universities

Samuel O. Thier
President
Brandeis University (MA)
Association of American Universities

Jeanne O'Laughlin, OP
President
Barry University (FL)
Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities

Albert J. DiUlio, SJ
President
Marquette University (WI)
Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities

Anita Pampusch
President
College of St. Catherine (MN)
Council of Independent Colleges

Arthur Thomas
President
Central State University (OH)
National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education

Author E. Hughes
President
University of San Diego (CA)
National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities

Donald C. Swain
President
University of Louisville (KY)
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

Janet Rodgers
Dean and Professor
Philip Y. Hahn School of Nursing
University of San Diego (CA)
American Association of Colleges of Nursing

Donald Stewart
President
The College Board
The College Board

Phillip M. Grier
Executive Director
National Association of College and University Attorneys
Washington Higher Education Secretariat

AMERICAN
COUNCIL ON
EDUCATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE